

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 19 and 21 are pending. Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 19 and 21 are rejected. Claim 21 is objected to. These items are addressed in response to the Detailed Action provided by the Examiner.

#### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 21 has been objected to as lacking antecedent basis. The Examiner has recommended a correction.

In response to item 1, and in order to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Applicant has amended claim 21 according to the recommendation of the Examiner. This amendment should not be construed as an admission regarding a lack of antecedent basis.

#### ***Claim Rejections***

3. Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

It is noted that on page 4 of the Office Action, that the Examiner has stated:

that if the Applicant can demonstrate that one skilled in the art could make and use the invention (by, for example, demonstrating the materials with the properties attributed to “memory access media” are well known to those skilled in the art), this rejection would be withdrawn and these claims would become allowable over the prior art of record.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits herein a properly executed declaration under 37 CFR §1.132, wherein the Inventor makes certain representations and declarations which address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Applicant is also submitting, in conjunction with the Affidavit filed pursuant to 37 CFR §1.132, a properly executed Information Disclosure Statement (IDS). A copy of the IDS and the references cited therein are included in this submission for convenience.

It is considered that as the references cited were identified by the Applicant at the request of the Examiner (in the non-final office action of 3/20/06) for a demonstration, and that as no item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, and, to the knowledge of the person signing the certification after making reasonable inquiry, no item of information contained in the information disclosure statement was known to any individual designated in § 1.56(c) more than three months prior to the filing of the information disclosure statement, no fee is due for the filing of the IDS.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicant's Attorneys

By 

Ira M. Turner  
Registration No. 53,887

Date: May 17, 2006  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929 x 1214  
Fax: (860) 286-0115

121325-1  
GE4-0005